

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the Abstract has been amended. Reconsideration of the allowability of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration, with claims 4-7, 12-15, and 20-24 having been indicated as including allowable subject matter.

OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT

The Abstract stands objected to for having more than 150 words. Accordingly, the Abstract has been amended to conform with the Examiner's helpful comments.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 1-3, 8-11, 16-19, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Tokui, U.S. Patent No. 5,987,532, in view of Kaneda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,864,921. This rejection respectfully traversed.

By way of review and as an example, independent claim 1 sets forth:

"[a] chained image display apparatus comprising a plurality of image display apparatuses connected in series and controlled by a central control unit, the chained image display apparatus comprising:

a control signal driving unit converting a control signal inputted to the image display apparatuses into a control signal having a predetermined level and buffering the control signal having the predetermined level; and

an examining unit transmitting an alert signal, in response to a power supply to one image display apparatus among the plurality of image display apparatuses being interrupted, to next and previous image display apparatuses which are connected to the one image display apparatus to which the power supply was interrupted, indicating that the power supply to the one image display apparatus is interrupted."

In particular, the independent claims claim (with differing scope and breadth) the transmitting of an alert, in response to a "power supply to one image display apparatus among the plurality of display apparatuses being interrupted," to next and previous display apparatuses, as stated in independent claim 1, for example.

Thus, there must be a plurality of display apparatus and the alert must be transmitted in response to an interruption of a power supply to one of the image display apparatuses.

The Office Action has indicated that Tokui sets forth the claimed control signal driving unit but fails to disclose the examining unit, i.e., the claimed "examining unit transmitting an alert signal, in response to a power supply to one image display apparatus among the plurality of image display apparatuses being interrupted, to next and previous image display apparatuses which are connected to the one image display apparatus to which the power supply was interrupted, indicating that the power supply to the one image display apparatus is interrupted."

To disclose this feature, the Office Action relies upon Kaneda et al., indicating that FIGS. 1 and 12, and col. 5, lines 47-56, and col. 10, lines 45-52, disclose these features.

First, Tokui sets forth a system of serially connected display units that transfer data through the serial connection. The focus of Tokui is in setting and using ID codes for each unit.

Kaneda et al. sets forth a system of controlling a screen with multiple display portions.

FIG. 1 of Kaneda et al. illustrates the representative Display System 1, which includes a video signal unit 10, a video signal selecting unit 11, a video processing unit 12, a screen unit 13, a power unit 14, a video capture unit 15, and a control and monitoring unit 16.

Here, the screen unit is made up of a plurality of separate display units, with each display unit being made up of a plurality of cells. See Kaneda et al. in col. 7, lines 20-34, and FIG. 5.

Each display unit is further illustrated in FIG. 6, wherein each display unit further includes an MPU.

Accordingly, the relied portion of the Kaneda et al. refer to the description of FIG. 1, setting out the different apparatuses making up the Display System 1. For example, in col. 5, lines 45-56, Kaneda et al. briefly describes the aforementioned separate apparatus making up the Display System in FIG. 1.

To set forth the claimed alert sending in response to a power interruption, the Office Action further relies upon Kaneda et al. in col. 10, lines 45-52, which refers to a power control portion 101 illustrated in a display system information providing window 100 of FIG. 12, i.e., a portion of the data illustrating window that shows/permits power control.

The corresponding portion of Kaneda et al. merely states that "[t]he power control portion 101 controls supply of power to apparatus[es] connected to the display system 1, such as the video signal selecting unit 11, the video processing unit 12, and the screen unit 13. The power

control portion 101 for example controls supply of power to the power unit 14 to thereby effect on-off control of power to the screen unit 13. Also, the power control portion 101 displays a state of power supply to each of the apparatus[es]."

Thus, here, the referred to power control portion of the control window merely displays the current power conditions for the separate apparatuses, including the screen unit 13, i.e., the screen unit 13 as a whole.

There is no suggestion in Kaneda et al. that any of the individual display units within the screen unit 13 are illustrated in the display system information providing window 100.

The closest that Kaneda et al. comes to setting forth detecting whether power has been interrupted for each display unit, of screen unit 13, is in col. 8, lines 3-24, wherein Kaneda et al. discusses that the individual MPUs of each display unit are supplied with abnormality information. In particular, the "abnormality information is generated when a light emitting element (a), a light emitting element (b), and a light emitting element (c) forming a cell of the display unit, for example, are set to emit light at +5V, +12V, and +24V, respectively, and a voltage value of any of the light emitting elements is lowered."

Thus, the closest that Kaneda et al. comes to setting forth detecting whether power has been interrupted for a particular display unit is when Kaneda et al. determines whether there is an abnormality within a particular cell within the display unit. However, for the MPU to even receive such an abnormality determination there must be power supplied to the MPU, and the internal information providing unit 38 must similarly be supplied with power.

Accordingly, Kaneda et al. fails to disclose or suggest either the detecting or alerting of a power interruption for any particular display unit. Further, the relied upon portions of Kaneda et al. merely refer to a large-scale view/monitoring of the display system, permitting whole apparatuses to be controlled, e.g., the whole screen 13 with all display units.

Therefore, a combination of Kaneda et al. and Tokui would not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention set forth in the independent claims. In addition, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims depending from the independent claims are equally patentably distinguishable over the currently cited art.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7/24/06

By: 

Stephen T. Boughner
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501